

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 7, 8, 19, 26, 29 and 31 have been amended. Claims 1-31 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 1 AND 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b):

Regarding claim 1:

At page 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 is rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by McDonald (US Patent No. 5,984,990). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants respectfully submit that McDonald fails to teach or suggest "an air cleaning apparatus...wherein the blowing unit and the filtering unit are slidably insertable and removable from the cabinet," as recited in claim 1.

Instead, McDonald discloses a workbench for golf club shafts including air filtration system. The filters may be positioned vertically or horizontally and are accessible from the front of the work bench (see column 3, lines 4-5).

McDonald fails to teach all of the features recited in amended claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is deemed to be allowable over McDonald. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 7:

At page 2 of the Office Action, claim 7 is rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lewis et al. (US Patent No. 5,435,837; hereinafter "Lewis"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Lewis fails to teach or suggest an air cleaning apparatus comprising "...a guide unit provided between the filter casing and an inner surface of the cabinet to support the filter casing in the cabinet, and between the fan casing and the inner surface of the cabinet to support the fan casing in the cabinet, wherein the fan casing and the filter casing are slidably removed from the cabinet in a horizontal direction," as recited in amended claim 7.

Lewis discloses a system for the operation of laundry dryers. The system including a filter unit provided in a cabinet, wherein the cabinet has fixed slide rails formed by channel lengths to receive a filter tray formed by a frame (see column 2, lines 51-59).

However, Lewis fails to teach all of the features recited in amended claim 7. Thus, claim 7 is deemed allowable over Lewis. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2-5, 8-15, AND 17-30 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2-5, 8-15 and 17-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald in view of Lewis. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claims 1 and 7, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of independent claims 19 and 26 over the cited references.

Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither McDonald nor Lewis, individually or combined, teach or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 1, 7, 19 and 26 from which claims 2-6, 8-15, 17-25 and 27-30 respectfully depend.

Therefore, the combination of McDonald and Lewis fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 7, 19 and 26 are deemed allowable over McDonald in view of Lewis. In addition, claims 2-6, 8-15, 17-25 and 27-30 are deemed allowable at least due to their dependency upon claims 1, 7, 19 and 26 respectively. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 6 AND 11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald in view of Lewis and further in view of Rosen (US Patent No. 5,525,136). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants respectfully assumes that the Examiner inaccurately rejected claim 11 instead of claim 16.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Rosen discloses the deficiencies of McDonald and Lewis. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Rosen discloses a gasketed multi-media air cleaner having a gasket attached to a rigid frame, housing an electrostatic filter and a replaceable filter media arranged in series (see column 3, lines 51-55).

However, neither of the foregoing references relied upon, individually or combined, teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1 and 7 from which claims 6 and 16 respectively depend. Therefore, the combination of McDonald, Lewis and Rosen fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 6 and 16 are deemed allowable at least due to their dependency upon claims 1 and 7, for the reasons mentioned above.

Therefore, the foregoing references relied upon fail to teach or suggest the advantage of being able to easily install and remove the filtering unit and the blowing unit from the cabinet of a air cleaning apparatus, thus making it easy to clean the apparatus and to replace the filters with new filters as in the claimed invention (see paragraph [0008] of the specification).

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

November 19, 2004

By:

Deidre M. Davis

Deidre M. Davis

Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1500